

I insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

**RESOLUTION**

Whereas, Kiwanis International is a God loving and God fearing organization; and Whereas, one of the prime goals of Kiwanis International for the year 1969 is to foster faith in God and to apply it to all of life's relationships; and

Whereas, the Kiwanis Club of Fort Lauderdale firmly believes that reverence to God and adherence to Godlike principles will promulgate peace and brotherhood throughout the universe; and

Whereas, the Kiwanis Club of Fort Lauderdale firmly believes that the spirit of God should nurture and guide our every thought, word and deed, whether it be in the home, business, industry or the sciences, Now, therefore, it is hereby Resolved that Astronauts Borman, Lovell and Anders, who displayed such awesome and unflinching courage in their Christmas orbit of the moon, be highly commended for their overt Christmas Eve prayers transmitted for the world to hear, as well as their unrestrained and unabashed faith in God as evidenced by said prayers.

Be it further Resolved that the Kiwanis Club of Fort Lauderdale wishes Astronauts Borman, Lovell and Anders, Godspeed in all of their future space pursuits.

Be it further Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to each of said Astronauts, the National Aeronautical and Space Administration, the President of the United States, and the Headquarters of Kiwanis International.

Dated this 7th day of January, 1969.

BERNIE B. WELCH,  
President, Kiwanis Club of Fort Lauderdale.

**DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND**

**HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the 90th Congress broadened special provisions for the blind in the 1967 social security legislation, but again failed to include in the final action two important provisions, even though these were passed by the Senate in 1964, 1965, and 1967. I am, therefore, introducing in the 91st Congress, a disability insurance for the blind bill to provide the coverage that has been left out of legislation to date.

This bill would change the existing law which requires a person to have worked 5 out of the 10 years prior to the date of application in order to be eligible for disability insurance payments; it would simply require working a year and a half under social security-covered work. The legislation would also allow a blind person to draw disability insurance payments so long as he remains blind, abolishing the present income-earning ceiling.

Successful action by the Congress is necessary to insure more simple, quicker accessibility to disability insurance for every blind person. Under the present law, furthermore, there are few incentives for a blind person to help himself, and society, also, by becoming productive

and earning to his full capacity. And as Kenneth Pernigan, president of the National Federation of the Blind, comments:

The real problem of blindness is not the loss of eyesight. It is the misunderstandings and the misconceptions which exist. With proper training and opportunity the average blind person can do the average job in the average place of business and do it as well as his sighted neighbor. The massive discriminations which exist against the blind in employment and in opportunity come from society as a whole, not merely from the blind members of society. Therefore, it is reasonable that society should insure its members against these disadvantages.

My bill would reduce the anxiety and grief which now occurs because of technical difficulties and disqualifications. It would provide the proper incentives and, as well, the social insurance rightfully due this group of people, and the social benefit desired for the entire society.

**ARMY MAKES ILL-ADVISED CHOICE FOR SENTINEL ABM SITE**

**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Army has selected a site, 5 miles from mainland Seattle, on Bainbridge Island, in Puget Sound, for a Sentinel ABM installation. Today, I was afforded the opportunity to express my opposition and the opposition of local Government officials to this location in executive session of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

And, I might add that the Army's site selection has been met with overwhelming opposition on Bainbridge Island, as indicated by thousands of petitions, telegrams, and letters I have received in my office.

As a result of today's hearing, I am not encouraged that the Army will accept the alternate sites I have offered, but the Committee on Armed Services has assured me of a hearing to which I hope the public will be invited.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, while the Army remains adamant in their choice of Bainbridge Island, I intend to continue my fight to have this proposed installation moved off the island.

I include my remarks before the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the House Appropriations Committee in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS M. PELLY, BEFORE THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, JANUARY 15, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to express my concern and the concern of the local officials over the selection of Fletcher Bay, on Bainbridge Island, in the State of Washington, as a site for the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile System. Please allow me to make it plain, Mr. Chairman, that I am not opposing the Sentinel System itself; to the contrary, there is strong support for locating in Kitsap County, but the opposition is to the location of Fletcher Bay. I might add that my opposition to this site is supported

by the Commissioners of Kitsap County, the county in which this proposed site is located; by the Mayor of the nearest town to the proposed site; by the city council of this town; and by the overwhelming majority of the people of Bainbridge Island.

To begin with, the Fletcher Bay location is in a growing residential area of high land value. There is only one bridge connecting this island with the mainland, so there is no easy access to or from this proposed site. In addition, there are no rail lines on the island. The issue here, simply stated, is that there appear to be other places in which this ABM complex can be located, still within the same county. Let me reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that the county commissioners support the location of the installation in their county, but they do not want it on Bainbridge Island.

A the outset, when Seattle was indicated as a location for a Sentinel ABM installation, I sought to determine the Army's criteria in building these complexes, so I pursued the matter on the Floor of the House during debate on the Military Construction Appropriation Bill last July 29. During this debate, I engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished Gentleman from Florida and Chairman of this Subcommittee, Mr. Sikes, as to what exactly the Army's criteria was for building these Sentinel sites. In reply to my question, Mr. Sikes stated that the sites would be some distance away from centers of population and every effort was being made, first, to use Government land wherever suitable land was owned already by the Government, and next, to arrive at a satisfactory decision with the local officials on a site which was the least objectionable to the people in the centers included in the program.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Army has done just the opposite of this. Not only is this site on Bainbridge Island in a residential area of more than 8,800 people, it is no more than 5 miles from mainland Seattle, across Puget Sound.

Let me say that I appreciate the hearing the Army conducted on Bainbridge Island on December 27, because it performed two functions. It informed the local officials and residents as to the Army's plans, which was the original purpose, but it also produced the statement from the Army that no such criteria existed. In fact, it was stated, the sites are to be located as close as possible to cities.

As to the criteria concerning the opposition of local people, let me say that within a few days following the hearing on Bainbridge Island, a petition was circulated which I am told contains over 3,000 names opposing the site. In addition, I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters opposing the Fletcher Bay site. To be frank, the number of letters in support of the site on Bainbridge Island can be counted on one hand.

So, let me emphasize! The Army is planning to locate this Sentinel site in a heavily populated area and against the wishes of the local officials and the local people, despite the criteria Mr. Sikes related to me on the Floor of the House last July.

The proposed site develops some overwhelming problems. One of these is the schools. I realize the Army's criteria is to move into an area with as little disruption as possible, but on Bainbridge Island the school districts have said they already are at their legal bonding limit and overcrowded. School experts are aware that Federal school impacted aid is a long time coming. The result is that this island's school districts face a severe strain that could more easily be assimilated in another area.

Another, and possibly insurmountable problem, is that of water. At the present time, Bainbridge Island has no surplus water supply. The water table has been falling for years, and as you know the Army informed the people of the Boston area that the Sentinel sites require 300 gallons of water per

minute, the bulk of which is for cooling purposes. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious matter because the question arises, where will the Army get the water they need in such large amounts? If the answer is wells, deep or shallow, then what is to happen to the existing wells?

Then, Mr. Chairman, the question arises, where on the Island will these people live? There are no rentals presently available on Bainbridge Island, and although base housing is contemplated for the 150 single Army personnel scheduled for the site, no provision is made for the 300 civilian personnel who will be imported as permanent site staff. This is additional reason why the site should be on the mainland.

And, then there is the cost to the American taxpayers for this land. The Army has decided to place their missile site on some of the most expensive property in the Pacific Northwest. Not only does this mean the acquisition cost is high, but the loss of revenue to the county is high because of the land value. Kitsap County has placed a tax evaluation on this land at about \$2,000 an acre.

The natural question then arises, where else should the site be located if not on Bainbridge Island.

Well, I have offered several alternate site locations to the Army, including the Bangor Ammunition Depot, two present airfield sites, and a location north of the Port Madison Indian Reservation. General Starbird has agreed to study these sites.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, these alternates are mainland sites, accessible by rail or highway and offering services not available on Bainbridge Island. The reason for suggesting the airport sites is because one of them is available at little or no cost because it is under the control of the Bremerton Port Commission; the other is on land far less expensive than that of Bainbridge Island, and the 7,000 acre Bangor Ammunition Depot presently is Government property which would require no acquisition cost. I realize the Navy is not going to look kindly to the Army wanting a portion of their land any more than the Army would appreciate the Navy wanting some of its property, but this is a far too important matter to allow service rivalries to prevail.

This is a matter of grave concern to the residents of Bainbridge Island and to me; I do not oppose the Sentinel System itself, but I do strongly protest its location on Bainbridge Island. Let me just add that, frankly, I fear the Army is not sincere in considering other sites; I fully expect the Army will find objections to each one. In other words, I believe its mind is made up and that no amount of practical reasoning is going to change their decision.

Again, Mr. Chairman, my deep appreciation for this opportunity to make my position known to you and the Subcommittee Members.

**RESTORATION OF THE FULL ANNUITY AND PERMIT RETIREE TO NAME A SECOND SPOUSE TO A SURVIVOR ANNUITY WHEN SUCH NEW SPOUSE HAS ATTAINED THE AGE OF 60, WHEN THE NAMED SURVIVOR PREDECEASES THE RETIREE**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the present retirement law provides that a retiree at time of retirement may elect to take a reduced annuity to provide a survivor

annuity for his spouse. This cost at the present time is 2½ percent on the first \$3,600 and 10 percent on the remainder, if any. The law also states that only one election can be made, and that at time of retirement.

When a retiree is predeceased by the named spouse he must continue to pay this cost through this reduced annuity as long as he lives although there never will be anyone who can receive the survivor annuity he is paying for, even though he remarries.

This bill provides for the restoration of the full annuity and/or permits the retiree to name his second spouse to a survivor annuity if the named survivor predeceases the retiree, and the second spouse has attained the age of 60.

Out of approximately 900,000 retirees and survivors there are several thousand that this would apply to.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that, when enacted into law, will correct some of these injustices and yet protect our older annuitants by providing that their second or third spouse must be at least 60 years of age in order to participate in this legislation. I am sure that a good percentage of our colleagues are not fully aware of this great injustice that prevails in thousands of the homes of our retirees from the Federal service. I strongly urge that my colleagues give serious consideration to and support this legislation.

#### AWARDED SILVER STAR

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Glenn Hoppert, a fine young man from Maryland, has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and further honor him by including the following citation in the RECORD:

#### CITATION

Hoppert, Glenn C. RA 13 868 042 (SSAN: NVAL), Specialist Four E4, United States Army, Company A, 2d Battalion (Airborne), 502d Infantry, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division APO 96347.

Awarded: Silver Star.

Date action: 13 January 1967.

Theater: Republic of Vietnam.

Reason: For gallantry in action against a hostile force on 13 January 1967 in the vicinity of Kontum, Republic of Vietnam. Specialist Hoppert was serving as a member of the point lead element while the company was moving along a ridgeline, toward high ground. Specialist Hoppert suddenly detected an enemy ambush, established along the intended route of travel. Without concern for his own safety, Specialist Hoppert charged the enemy position and killed one of the enemy soldiers, causing the remainder to flee. After the company had traveled forward a short distance, it was brought under a tremendous volume of fire from an entrenched enemy element of estimated squad size. On the initial burst of fire, the command element of the company was pinned down. Reacting quickly and with disregard for his own safety, Specialist Hoppert charged

through intense enemy fire and placed effective fire into the enemy position. As he neared the position, he threw a grenade and killed four more enemy soldiers and caused the remaining enemy to retreat. Specialist Hoppert's valorous actions resulted in the destruction of two enemy positions, five enemy killed and the saving of several American lives. Specialist Hoppert's outstanding display of gallantry in action and his avid devotion to duty are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President under the provisions of the Act of Congress, approved 9 July 1918.

#### STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF THE DISPLAY OF VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION PROGRAMS

**HON. JOHN M. MURPHY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been a tremendous increase of violence in America, an increase not just in the physical acts of violence, but in philosophies of violence. More and more people seek to express their views and work toward their objectives through the use of violence. The legal channels of communication which form the foundation of our system of government are too often ignored or abused.

This increase in violence tends to isolate people from each other, and from the community. The basic fabric of society—mutual trust, a common purpose, a willingness to sacrifice and labor in the hopes of providing a better way of life—is being eroded by fear, intolerance and selfishness, and a tendency to care for one's self and family, and nothing else.

The increase in acts of violence in our society is not the only problem, however. Even more alarming is the corresponding increase in the acceptance of violence by the American people—not acceptance in the sense of approval, but in the sense of being blunted or immune to its often tragic consequences.

This attitude may be seen in the faces of a crowd watching an assault in broad daylight without offering assistance to the victim or even calling the police; it may be heard in the voices of those who shout "jump, you coward, jump" to the sick person on a bridge who has been driven to suicide by some unknown impulse.

As a society we are justifiably concerned with preventing and punishing the physical acts of violence; we seek to understand and alleviate the causes of such violence, we seek to protect our people and our property from violence, and we punish those who are guilty of violent acts.

It is obvious, however, that we have followed too narrow a path in our concern for preventing violence. At the same time we condemn violence, we buy our children toy tanks and machineguns